

Atty. Docket No.: PALM.0933

Patent 10/696,153

REMARKS

With this amendment, Claims 1-10, 30-31, 35-36, and 43-44 are amended.
Claims 11-29, 32-33, 38, and 40-42 have been or are herewith cancelled.
Furthermore, Claim 9 and 30 have been recast in independent form as they were indicated as being allowable.

Office Action Summary

The Office Action indicates Claims 36, 37 and 39 are allowable. Further, Claims 9, 30 and 31 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the double-patenting rejection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 112.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 34, 43-46, 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,613,135 ("Sakai") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,738 ("Townesley").

Claims 1-10, 30-31, 34-35, and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1-10, 30-31, 34-37, and 39-51 stand rejected under doctrine of double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,124.

Double Patenting Rejections

Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason. U.S. Patent No. 6,523,124 requires in each claim a "signal line" which detects whether "a communication device" is actively coupled. The claims presented with this paper do not use a signal line to detect an active connection to a communication device or other device. Rather, in Claims 4 (as amended), 30, 31, 36 for example, signal line(s) is/are recited for purpose of determine a type of communication device (not whether the communication device is actively connected).

Atty. Docket No.: PALM.0933

Patent 10/696,153

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The “signal” was removed from Claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection for the following reason. In Sakai, the portable computer has its power regulated by a power controller that is internal to the computer. Column 8, for example, recites “When an AC adapter is connected to the system, the power save mode is invalidated.” [Column 8, line 4-6]. The “power supply controller” controls its system power supply. [Column 7, line 34-36].

With regard to Claims 1-8, and 34-35, and 43, Applicant is claiming a portable computing device that “detects an external computing device is actively connected to communicate and provide power to the portable computing device...” Among other things, the power supply controller of Sakai is neither external nor connected to communicate.

With regard to Claims 44-51, Applicant is claiming “detecting whether an external power is being provided to the portable computing device from a computing device external to the portable computing device.” As mentioned, the power supply controller of Sakai is not external. Further, Claim 44 recites: “causing the external computing device and the portable computing device to communicate with one another in response to a user-interaction with an interface of external computing device.” It will be appreciated that Sakai does not teach an external computing device other than the portable computing device which provides an interface for receiving user-interaction, let alone enabling this interaction to cause communication to occur between the two computing devices.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 and 30 were indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, Applicant has recast those claims in independent form. Claim 10 now depends from Claim 9.

Claim 36, 37 and 39 were also indicated as being allowable.

Atty. Docket No.: PALM.0933

Patent 10/696,153

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. The allowance of the claims is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any issues that remain to be resolved prior to allowance of the claims.

AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

Please charge deposit account 501914 for any underpayments in connection with this Office Action response.

Respectfully submitted,
Shemwell Mahamedi LLP

Date: March 22, 2006

Van Mahamedi 42,828
Tel. 408-551-6632

Shemwell Mahamedi LLP
4880 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 201
San Jose CA 95129